

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 7 and 9-12 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 have been amended. Claims 2, 4-6 and 8 have been cancelled. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner did not indicate whether or not the formal drawings have been accepted. Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 26, 2006 and December 22, 2006, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 forms filed therewith.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, all pending claims are now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (JP 2003-258539). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejections is set forth in the Office Action, and is not repeated herein.

Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the present invention over the reference relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, independent claim 1 now recites a combination of elements including "a substantially planar radiating conductor; a substantially planar ground conductor having larger area than the radiating conductor; a dielectric substrate being set between the radiating conductor and the ground conductor; and a feeding cable, one terminal of the feeding cable being connected to the radiating conductor, the other terminal being connected to the ground conductor, wherein *the radiating conductor and the ground conductor are cloth-like substances having flexibility and conductivity, and also the dielectric substrate is a cloth-like substance having flexibility and insulation property; and wherein the connection of the terminal of the feeding cable to the*

radiating conductor or the ground conductor is attained by soldering through a metallic plate-like substance adhered with conductive adhesives at a surface opposing to the radiating conductor or the ground conductor.” Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements set forth in claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Tanaka.

Specifically, referring to Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0038]-[0040] of the present application, the solder (24) is made through the conductive medium (23) composed of the metallic plate-like substance (23) adhered with conductive adhesives (23a) at a surface opposing to the radiating conductor (11) or the ground conductor (12). The conductive medium (23) may be a conductive tape integrated combination of the conductive adhesives (23a) such as an acrylic-based conductive adhesive and the metallic plate-like substance (23b) such as copper foil etc.. By using the conductive medium (23), soldering can be carried out easily and thermal degradation of conductive cloth such as a polyester can be suppressed, since the conductive cloth does not directly contact with a high temperature solder iron or the solder (24).

On page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicates that paragraphs [0004]-[0008] of Tanaka teach that the connection of the terminal of the feeding cable to the radiating conductor or the ground conductor is attained by soldering through a conductive medium as set forth in the present application. However, Applicants respectfully disagree. A careful review of Tanaka indicates that Tanaka nowhere teaches a method for preparing a microstrip antenna, in particular the connection of the terminal of a feeding cable to a radiating conductor or a ground conductor being attained by soldering. Further, Tanaka nowhere teaches a metallic plate-like substance being adhered with conductive adhesives at a surface opposing to the radiating conductor or the ground conductor. Applicants respectfully submit that the

Examiner's rejection regarding this feature is too general, and actually, there is no element disclosed by Tanaka being equivalent to the metallic plate-like substance as recited in claim 1.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. *See M.P.E.P. §2131; M.P.E.P. §706.02.* Accordingly, if the cited reference fails to teach or suggest one or more claimed elements, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this case, it is submitted that Tanaka fails to teach or suggest that “*the connection of the terminal of the feeding cable to the radiating conductor or the ground conductor is attained by soldering through a metallic plate-like substance adhered with conductive adhesives at a surface opposing to the radiating conductor or the ground conductor*” as recited in claim 1, and therefore fails to anticipate claim 1.

Since Tanaka fails to teach each and every claimed feature as recited in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 clearly defines over the teachings of Tanaka.

In addition, claims 3, 7 and 9-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable, or as well as due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

For example, regarding claims 7 and 9, it is recited that “*the radiating conductor or the ground conductor is a cloth woven or compressed by a polyester/an aramid polyester fiber which is coated with copper and covered with a surface nickel layer on the copper coating.*” On page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that “it would have been obvious to a skilled person at the time the invention was made to select the material of the metal plate to be of

copper, or cloth is woven, polyester, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.” Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the above-mentioned feature set forth in claims 7 and 9 is not merely a matter of design choices.

Specifically, it is noted that Tanaka is apparently silent on the matter of the material of the element, and the Office Action presents absolutely no objective factual evidence of proper motivation by one of ordinary skill in the art to achieve the features of the present application that *the radiating conductor or the ground conductor can be a cloth which is woven or compressed by a polyester or an aramid fiber which is coated with copper and covered with a surface nickel layer on the copper coating*. Additionally, it is noted that in the present application, the radiating conductor or the ground conductor having surface of nickel can not be connected with the feeding cable by soldering. In order to solve this problem, the connection of the terminal of a feeding cable to a radiating conductor or a ground conductor is attained by soldering through a metallic plate-like substance adhered with conductive adhesives at a surface opposing to the radiating conductor or the ground conductor. It is clear that the selection of the material of the metal plate substance and the conductor is not merely a matter of design choice, and Tanaka fails to teach or suggest this feature as set forth in claims 7 and 9. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 9 clearly define over Tanaka.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 7 and 9-12 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant